



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,834	03/25/2004	Jiun-Yao Huang	250913-1160	7950
24504	7590	10/07/2008	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP			ANDREWS, LEON T	
600 GALLERIA PARKWAY, S.E.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
STE 1500			2416	
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5994				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/07/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/809,834	HUANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LEON ANDREWS	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-32 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-32 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

RCE

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 14, 2008 has been entered.

- **Claims 1, 17 and 21** were amended.
- **Claim 5** was cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 – First Paragraph

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, lines 13-14 and Claim 17, lines 15-16 recited ‘response code greater than 199’.

Nowhere in the original specification recites this newly added limitation. First, applicant specification, page 8, lines 24-26 discloses "486 busy". Thus, it is clear that the specification does not disclose this newly added limitation ‘response code greater than 199’. Second, RFC 3261 Section 21, pages 182-193, as alleged by the applicant that it contains support for this new limitation, disclose the code such as "180, 183,.....,606". Thus, it is also clear that the RFC does not disclose/support the newly added limitation ‘response code greater than 199’.

Claims 2-16 and 18-32 are also rejected for the same reason as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112- second paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, lines 13-14 and Claim 17, lines 15-16 recited ‘response code greater than 199’.

It is unclear whether "greater than 199" covers the code(s) that are disclosed by the applicant within the specification, or the codes that are greater than 199, which can be infinity. (note- in the code were infinity, the applicant may not have support for it, see above rejection for 112, first paragraph).

For the purpose of the examiner, examiner will assume that the code are within the known and acceptable codes.

Claims 2-16 and 18-32 are also rejected for the same reason as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 17 are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell Labs Technical Journal in view of Mayer (Pub. No.: US 2005/0015499 A1).

Regarding Claim 1, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) for IP multimedia service control (IMS service control, page 27, line 16), comprising:

recording (register request to application server by S-CSCF, column 1, page 32, lines 30-31)

a Session Initial Protocol (SIP) request message (Fig. 3, SIP register message, column 1, page 32, line 17) received by a Serving Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) (Fig. 3, Serving CSCF, the message is forwarded to the appropriate S-CSCF, column 1, page 32, lines 22-23);

the S-CSCF receiving a SIP response message associated to the SIP request message (SIP request comes in and the priority filter criteria is considered and selected by the S-CSCF passing the SIP request to the application server which modifies the request and sends it back to the S-CSCF in a response (message) to the SIP request, pages 32-33, column 2 and 1, lines 5-15 and 1-5 respectively);

the S-CSCF examining the SIP response message according to a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC) (the S-CSCF selects the priority of the filter criteria and the application server modifies the SIP request and sends it back (response message) to the S-CSCF which continues the process until all the different priorities of the filter criteria are considered in responding to the SIP request depending on what services the user is using or is eligible to use, columns 2 and 1, pages 32 and 33, lines 6-15 and 1-9 respectively) comprising specific responses triggering individual application services available from a service provider (filtering criteria tailors which service platforms and service providers have the ability to control services on a per subscriber basis with the application server using service triggering points to apply service finding the most attractive services to enhance subscriber satisfaction, column 1, page 33, lines 21-27); and

reissuing the SIP request message (Figure 9, SIP INVITE) to an application server (Figure 9, CF AS) designated by the rFC (Figure 9, filter criteria, column 2, page 40, line 4) if the corresponding SIP response message (Figure 9, SIP 100) matches (Fig. 9, 9, filter criteria matches for AS) Service Point Triggers (SPTs) (application servers use service triggering points to apply service logic, column 1, page 33, lines 23-25) of one of the rFC (Figure 9, UE is updated, a NOTIFY is sent to the application sever and, when a call comes in for the UE (steps 2-9) SIP INVITE is forwarded to the application server (reissued) based on the filter criteria which matched for AS, columns 2, 1 and 2, pages 39 and 40, lines 44-45, 1 and 1-4 respectively); wherein the SIP response message is a final response (the S-CSCF selects the priority of the filter criteria and the application server modifies the SIP request and sends it back (response message) to the S-CSCF which continues the process until all the different priorities of the filter criteria are considered or the service logic performed in the application server results in a final response to the SIP request depending on what services the user is using or is eligible to use, columns 2 and 1, pages 32 and 33, lines 6-15 and 1-9 respectively) with a response code greater than 199 (Fig. 9, SIP response messages, 200 OK, column 1, page 41, lines 17-18).

Bell Labs Technical Journal teaches the limitations of the claim including S-CSCF and filter. But, Bell Labs Technical Journal fails to specifically teach SIP response message received by S-CSCF according filter criteria.

However, Mayer teaches SIP request received is forwarded to S-CSCF and S-CSCF responds to SIP request per the event filter, page 3, lines 10-17.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Mayer's SIP response message received by S-SCCF according to filter criteria because this would have allowed communicating with any kind of multimedia system in which SIP signaling between the terminal and the multimedia enabling system is used, page 3, lines 3-5.

Regarding Claim 17, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9) for IP multimedia service control (IMS service control, page 27, line 16), comprising:

one or more application servers each designated by a response Filter Criteria (rFC) to provide a service (each application dictated by the filter criteria gets application server specific or service specified data, page 32, lines 31-34); and

a Serving Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) receiving a Session Initial Protocol (SIP) response message associated to a SIP request message (SIP request comes in and the priority filter criteria is considered and selected by the S-CSCF passing the SIP request to the application server which modifies the request and sends it back to the S-CSCF in a response (message) to the SIP request, pages 32-33, column 2 and 1, lines 5-15 and 1-5 respectively), examining the SIP response message by a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC) (the S-CSCF selects the priority of the filter criteria and the application server modifies the SIP request and sends it back (response message) to the S-CSCF which continues the process until all the different priorities of the filter criteria are considered in responding to the SIP request depending on what services the user is using or is eligible to use, columns 2 and 1, pages 32 and 33, lines 6-

15 and 1-9 respectively), and reissuing the SIP request message (Figure 9, SIP INVITE) to an application server (Figure 9, CF AS) when Service Point Triggers (SPTs) (application servers use service triggering points to apply service logic, column 1, page 33, lines 23-25) in a rFC (Figure 9, UE is updated, a NOTIFY is sent to the application sever and, when a call comes in for the UE (steps 2-9) SIP INVITE is forwarded to the application server (reissued) based on the filter criteria which matched for AS, columns 2, 1 and 2, pages 39 and 40, lines 44-45, 1 and 1-4 respectively) that designates to the application server is matched by the SIP response message; wherein the SIP response message is a final response (the S-CSCF selects the priority of the filter criteria and the application server modifies the SIP request and sends it back (response message) to the S-CSCF which continues the process until all the different priorities of the filter criteria are considered or the service logic performed in the application server results in a final response to the SIP request depending on what services the user is using or is eligible to use, columns 2 and 1, pages 32 and 33, lines 6-15 and 1-9 respectively) with a response code greater than 199 (Fig. 9, SIP response messages, 200 OK, column 1, page 41, lines 17-18).

Bell Labs Technical Journal teaches the limitations of the claim including S-CSCF and filter criteria. But, Bell Labs Technical Journal fails to specifically teach SIP response message received by S-CSCF according filter criteria.

However, Mayer teaches SIP request received is forwarded to S-CSCF and S-CSCF responds to SIP request per the event filter, page 3, lines 10-17.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Mayer's SIP response message received by S-SCCF according to

filter criteria because this would have allowed communicating with any kind of multimedia system in which SIP signaling between the terminal and the multimedia enabling system is used, page 3, lines 3-5.

Regarding Claim 2, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses the triggering method according to claim 1, further comprising setting up a list of SPTs (upon receipt of a session initiation trigger, the application checks the availability of all conferees and set up accordingly, column 2, page 36, lines 1-3) of the rFC for matching the corresponding SIP response message.

Regarding Claims 3 and 18, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the SPTs of the rFC are defined by:

SIP response code (Fig. 9, Cx Response, SIP response messages, 200 OK, column 1, page 41, lines 17-18);

an SIP method of the SIP request message (method of a SIP request, column 1, page 32, line 43);

a content of a header field (content of a SIP header, column 2, page 32, lines 32-33); and a direction of the SIP request message (Fig. 3, 4. Request).

Regarding Claims 4, 7, 19 and 22, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem

(internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the S-CSCF examines the SPTs of the rFC or iFC one by one according to their indicated priority (request that is the output of the first application server is subject to the next highest priority filter criteria and, if it satisfies these criteria, it is input to the corresponding second application server. This process continues until all the different filter criteria priorities are considered or final response to SIP request resulted, column 2, page 32, lines 42-45 and column 1, page 33, lines 1-5).

Regarding Claims 6 and 21, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), further comprising the steps of:

examining the SIP request message received by the S-CSCF (S-CSCF sends a third-party register request to each application server dedicated by the filter criteria, column 1, page 32, lines 30-32) according to a set of initial Filter Criteria (iFC) (set of initial criteria, column 1, page 32, line 26); and

reissuing the SIP request message to the application server designated by the iFC if the SIP request message matches (Figure 9, UE is updated, a NOTIFY is sent to the application sever and, when a call comes in for the UE (steps 2-9) SIP INVITE is forwarded to the application server (reissued) based on the filter criteria which matched for AS, columns 2, 1 and 2, pages 39 and 40, lines 44-45, 1 and 1-4 respectively) Service Point Triggers (SPTs) (application servers use service triggering points to apply service logic, column 1, page 33, lines 23-25) of one of the iFC (set of initial criteria, column 1, page 32, line 26).

Regarding Claims 8 and 24, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the rFC are stored in a Home Subscriber Server (HSS) as part of the user profile (Fig. 3, HSS 5. Profile; HSS is queried for the user's profile which includes filter criteria, column 1, page 32, lines 24-26).

Regarding Claims 9 and 25, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the rFC are downloaded to the S-CSCF upon user registration (Fig. 3, registration process within S-CSCF includes querying the HSS for the user's profile which includes filter criteria, column 1, page 32, lines 23-26).

Regarding Claims 10 and 26, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the application server is an SIP application server (SIP application server, page 27, line 15).

Regarding Claims 11 and 27, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the application

server is an Internet Protocol (IP) Multimedia Service Switching Function (IP-SSF) (IMS service control (ISC) on application server, page 27, lines 16-17).

Regarding Claims 12 and 28, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the application server is an Open Service Access (OSA) Service Capability Server (SCS) (Fig. 4, IMS application servers are represented by the SIP application server and the OSA gateway, column 2, page 33, line 26-28; within the IMS, access to OSA is offered through a gateway which is seen as a special case of a SIP application server, column 1, page 34, lines 3-5).

Regarding Claims 13 and 29, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the triggering method is applied when the application servers are selected depending on a content of the corresponding SIP response message (response to the SIP request resulted in the logic performed in one of the application servers, column 1, page 33, lines 3-5).

Regarding Claims 14 and 30, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9) according to claim 13, wherein the corresponding SIP response message represents a connection status is line busy

(rerouting decisions are based on criteria such as busy, column 1, page 39, lines 38-39).

Regarding Claims 15 and 31, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the corresponding SIP response message represents a connection status of destination unreachable (rerouting decisions are based on criteria such as no answer, column 1, page 39, lines 38-40) or not found.

Regarding Claims 16 and 32, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses a triggering method (method, column 1, page 32, line 42) and an Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9), wherein the corresponding SIP response message represents a connection status of call setup failure (Fig. 9, 0. Notify, called party unavailable).

Regarding Claim 20, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses the Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9) according to claim 17, wherein the S-CSCF records (Fig. 9, CF-AS, CF application server updates its subscriber records, column 1, page 40, lines 3-5) the SIP request message (S-CSCF adds an identifying indication to a request before forwarding it to an application server so that it can identify the message that comes back from the application server, column 1, page 33, lines 14-17) to be reissued to the application server designated by the rFC when the corresponding SIP

response message (Fig. 9, SIP 100) matches (Fig. 9, 9, filter criteria matches for AS) the SPTs (application servers use service triggering points to apply service logic, column 1, page 33, lines 23-25) of one of the rFC (filter criteria, column 2, page 40, line 4).

Regarding Claim 23, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses the Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (internet protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem (IMS), page 27, lines 7-9) according to claim 21, wherein the S-CSCF selectively disables the function of examining the rFC (S-CSCF uses filter criteria to involve the application servers and the filtering is done on the SIP message such as BYE, column 1, page 32, lines 37-40).

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Madour et al. (Pub No.: US 2004/0109459 A1) discloses packet filter provisioning to a packet data access node.

Trossen (Pub. No.: US 2004/0260819 A1) discloses systems and methods for restricting event subscriptions through proxy-based filtering.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed August 14, 2008 have been considered. But, in view of the new grounds of rejections, the arguments are moot.

- In the remarks on pages 9 and 12 of the amendment, applicant contends in claims 1 and 17, Bell Labs Technical Journal failed to disclose the 'the S-CSCF receiving a SIP response message associated to the SIP request message'. And, "wherein the SIP response message is a final response with a response code greater than 199". Also, "one or more application servers each designated by a response Filter Criteria (rFC) to provide a service; and". Further, "and re-issuing the SIP request message to an application server when a Service Point Trigger (SPT) is a rFC that designates to the application server is matched by the SIP response message; wherein the SIP response message is a final response with a response code greater than 199".
- The examiner respectfully contends that in claims 1 and 17, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses "SIP request comes in and the priority filter criteria is considered and selected by the S-CSCF passing the SIP request to the application server which modifies the request and sends it back to the S-CSCF in a response (message) to the SIP request, pages 32-33, column 2 and 1, lines 5-15 and 1-5 respectively". And, "the S-CSCF selects the priority of the filter criteria and the application server modifies the SIP request and sends it back (response message) to the S-CSCF which continues the process until all the different priorities of the filter criteria are considered or the service

logic performed in the application server results in a final response to the SIP request depending on what services the user is using or is eligible to use, columns 2 and 1, pages 32 and 33, lines 6-15 and 1-9 respectively) with a response code greater than 199 (Fig. 9, SIP response messages, 200 OK, column 1, page 41, lines 17-18) “. Response code greater than 199 was not disclosed in the specifications as cited by applicant. Also, "each application dictated by the filter criteria gets application server specific or service specified data, page 32, lines 31-34 “. Further, reissuing the SIP request message (Figure 9, SIP INVITE) to an application server (Figure 9, CF AS) when Service Point Triggers (SPTs) (application servers use service triggering points to apply service logic, column 1, page 33, lines 23-25) in a rFC (Figure 9, UE is updated, a NOTIFY is sent to the application sever and, when a call comes in for the UE (steps 2-9) SIP INVITE is forwarded to the application server (reissued) based on the filter criteria which matched for AS, columns 2, 1 and 2, pages 39 and 40, lines 44-45, 1 and 1-4 respectively) that designates to the application server is matched by the SIP response message; wherein the SIP response message is a final response (the S-CSCF selects the priority of the filter criteria and the application server modifies the SIP request and sends it back (response message) to the S-CSCF which continues the process until all the different priorities of the filter criteria are considered or the service logic performed in the application server results in a final response to the SIP request depending on what services the user is using or is eligible to use,

columns 2 and 1, pages 32 and 33, lines 6-15 and 1-9 respectively) with a response code greater than 199 (Fig. 9, SIP response messages, 200 OK, column 1, page 41, lines 17-18).

- In the remarks on pages 12 and 13 of the amendment, applicant contends that in claim 1, Mayer does not teach "re-issuing the SIP request message to an application server designated by the rFC". Also, Mayer does not discuss or suggest an operation on a SIP response message. Further, applicant requests that the withdrawal of the rejections of independent claims 1 and 17 and all their dependent claims.
- The examiner respectfully contends that in claim 1, the limitation "re-issuing the SIP request message to an application server designated by the rFC" was taught by Bell Labs Technical Journal and not by Mayer. Also, examiner maintains the prosecution that Mayer's SIP response message received by S-SCCF according to filter criteria because this would have allowed communicating with any kind of multimedia system in which SIP signaling between the terminal and the multimedia enabling system is used, page 3, lines 3-5. Further, the rejections of independent claims 1 and 17 and all their dependent claims will not be withdrawn.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon Andrews whose telephone number is (571) 270-1801. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rao S. Seema can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LA/la
September 29, 2008

/Ian N. Moore/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2616